

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILE	NG DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/593,550	06/	/14/2000	Brian W. Ables	24764A	7906
22889	7590	10/24/2002			
OWENS CO	RNING		EXAMINER		
2790 COLUM			GRAY, JILL M		
GRANVILLE	t, OH 430	123			
				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				1774	10
				DATE MAILED: 10/24/2002	, –

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
		09/593,550	ABLES ET AL
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
		Jill M Gray	1774
		nication appears on the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence address
Period fo	7 -		JONETHON FROM
THE N - Exten after: - If the - If NO - Failui - Any re	MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUN nsions of time may be available under the provision SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this com period for reply specified above is less than thirty (period for reply is specified above, the maximum sere to reply within the set or extended period for reply	s of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a munication. 30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of th	reply be timely filed irty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. NBANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) f	iled on <u>07 August 2002</u> .	
2a)□	This action is FINAL.	2b)⊠ This action is non-final.	
3)□ Dispositi		on for allowance except for formal matrice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C	atters, prosecution as to the merits is D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.
4) 🖾	Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the	application.	
	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>1-16 and</u>	19-21 is/are withdrawn from conside	eration.
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)⊠	Claim(s) 17,18 and 22-31 is/are reju	ected.	
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8) 🗌	Claim(s) are subject to restri	ction and/or election requirement.	
Applicati	on Papers		
9) 🔲 -	The specification is objected to by the	ne Examiner.	
10) 🔲 🗆	The drawing(s) filed on is/are	: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by	the Examiner.
	,,	ojection to the drawing(s) be held in abe	
11) 🗌 -		ed on is: a) approved b)	disapproved by the Examiner.
🗀 -	If approved, corrected drawings are re	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
-	The oath or declaration is objected t	o by the Examiner.	
-	ınder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		
•	-	n for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C.	. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a)[☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:		
	1. Certified copies of the priority	documents have been received.	
	2. Certified copies of the priority	documents have been received in	Application No
* S	application from the Inter	of the priority documents have bee national Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)) on for a list of the certified copies no	•
14) 🗌 A	acknowledgment is made of a claim	for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C	. § 119(e) (to a provisional application
	•	nguage provisional application has for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C	
Attachment	t(s)		
2) Notice	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) l	PTO-948) 5) Notice o	v Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) f Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

Application/Control Number: 09/593,550

Art Unit: 1774

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

The rejection of claims 17-18 and 22-31 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Charter et al, 4,117,067, is withdrawn in view of applicants arguments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

2. Claims 17-18, 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yamada et al, 4,427,482 (Yamada) or Pollet et al, 5,024,890 (Pollet) or Dunbar 4,898,770.

Yamada, Pollet and Dunbar each teach string binders and preforms and molded articles formed therefrom, as required from claims 17-18 and 22-23. See Yamada, abstract, Pollet, column 3, line 52-column 4, line 21, and Dunbar, abstract. Applicants' claims are product-by-process claims. Even though the product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. If the product in the product-by-process claims are the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior art was made by a different process. In the instant case, the claimed string binder, preform and molded article are the same as the prior art products of Yamada, Pollet and Dunbar. Accordingly, it is the position of the examiner that the invention as claimed in claims 17-18 and 22-23 are anticipated by the teachings in the prior art.

Application/Control Number: 09/593,550

Art Unit: 1774

3. Claims 17-18 and 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Woodside 5,972,503.

Woodside teaches a string binder, preform, and composite molded article formed therefrom, as required by claims 17-18 and 22-23, said composite molded article having a matrix material of the type contemplated by applicants in claims 24-25. In addition, Woodside teaches that his roving comprises reinforcing fibers and string binders as set forth by claims 26 and 29, and that the rovings can be chopped into pellets, as required by claims 27 and 30, wherein the chopped pellets have a length within the range set forth by applicants in claims 28 and 31. See abstract, column 4, lines 45-64, column 6, lines 29-43 and 60-63, column 7, lines 19-22, column 8, lines 59-64, and column 34, line 65 through column 35, line 5. Claims 26 and 29 rely in part on product-by-process limitations. As set forth previously, the patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production, particularly if the prior art product is the same or obvious over the instant claimed product. It is the examiner's position that the instant claimed product of claims 17-18 and 22-31 is the same as the prior art product taught by Woodside. Accordingly, the invention as claimed in claims 17-18 and 22-31 is anticipated by the prior art teachings of Woodside.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 17-18 and 22-31 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

No claims are allowed.

Conclusion

Application/Control Number: 09/593,550 Page 4

Art Unit: 1774

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jill M Gray whose telephone number is 703.308.2381. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cynthia Kelly can be reached on 703.308.0449. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703.305.5408 for regular communications and 703.305.3599 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is

703.308.0651.

Art Unit 1774

jmg October 20, 2002